United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 5 POLLUTION REPORT

Monday, May 24, 2004 Date:

Jeff Kimble/James Justice, OSC From:

To: W. Messenger, U.S. EPA

Stuart Hill, U.S. EPA Afif Marouf, U.S. EPA John Maritote, U.S. EPA

Bruce King, City of Detroit - Dept. Env. Duty Officer, USCG

Affairs

N Seif, MDEO Mick Hans, U.S. EPA Beverly Kush, U.S. EPA Jason El-Zein, USEPA Tracy Kecskemeti, MDEO Michelle Jaster, US EPA

Subject: Initial and Final Polrep

Mystery - E04513

Schaefer Road, Dearborn, II

POLREP No.: Z5EP Site #:

Reporting Period: D.O. #:

Start Date: 5/20/2004 Response Authority: OPA

Mob Date: **5/20/2004 Response Type:** Emergency Completion Date: 5/23/2004 NPL Status: Non NPL

CERCLIS ID #: **Incident Category:** Removal Assessment

RCRIS ID #: Contract #

Federal Project # E04513 Reimbursable Account # Z5EP

Site Description

The site is located on the River Rouge in Dearborn, Wayne County, Michigan. The impacted area begins at the Severstal North American Inc. (PRP) Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) on the west side of Schaefer Road and continues south down the Rouge River. This facility was formerly known as the Rouge Steel Company. The outfall from the lagoons where the sheen is suspected of coming from is a submerged outfall in the river.

Current Activities

On Thursday, May 20, 2004, at approximately 1700 hours, U.S. EPA arrived on-site to begin emergency assessment activities. US EPA observed an oil sheen on the river which appeared to be originating from retention lagoons on the PRPs property. US EPA took photographs of the sheen in the lagoon area and on the river. No visible oil seen was documented upstream of this property. US EPA issued a Notice of Federal Interest (NOFI) to the PRP. The PRP accepted the NOFI, but refused to sign it. PRP contractors were mobilized to the site. At approximately 2200 hours, the contractors arrived on site and began placing sorbent boom in the river downstream of the outfall. Sorbent boom was also placed in the oil lagoon at the

WWTP.

On Friday, May 21, 2004, the site was re-visited to check booms that were placed along the Rouge River. The boom was noted to be disconnected and not working properly. US EPA directed the PRP to mobilize their contractor back out to site and fix the sorbent boom.

On Saturday, May 22, 2004, USCG responded to a report of sheen on the river and also notified US EPA. US EPA responded and observed that the boom across the Rouge River was completely gone. Oil sheen was still visible on the PRPs property and getting through the system into the Rouge River. US EPA directed the PRP to mobilize their contractors to the WWTP and place more absorbent boom in between the baffles. US EPA directed the PRP to maintain the protective boom.

On Sunday, May 23, 2004, the site was re-visited to check booms that were placed along the Rouge River. Sheen was still visible on the river, but was greatly reduced and the river flow was reduced.

Planned Removal Actions

None

Next Steps

US EPA will continue to monitor the situation.

Key Issues

MDEQ is following up with site inspections to verify the PRPs compliance with their NPDES permit.

MDEQ will be working with the facility to address the operation of the retention lagoons to eliminate the discharge of oil/sheen into the river.

During the response on 5/22/04, sheen from a separate source was noted upstream from the PRPs facility. That release is being handled as a separate project.

Estimated Costs *

	Total To		%	
	Budgeted	Date	Remaining	Remaining
Extramural Costs				
RST/START	\$2,800.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00	50.00%
Intramural Costs	V, 200, 200, 200, 200, 200, 200, 200,			,
USEPA - Direct (Region, HQ)	\$5,000.00	\$1,000.00	\$4,000.00	80.00%
USEPA - InDirect	\$10,000.00	\$2,000.00	\$8,000.00	80.00%

Total Site Costs \$17,800.00 \$4,400.00 \$13,400.00 75.28%

* The above accounting of expenditures is an estimate based on figures known to the OSC at the time this report was written. The OSC does not necessarily receive specific figures on final payments made to any contractor(s). Other financial data which the OSC must rely upon may not be entirely up-to-date. The cost accounting provided in this report does not necessarily represent an exact monetary figure which the government may include in any claim for cost recovery.

www.epaosc.net/Mystery-E04513